

REMARKS

The claims have been amended in order to improve the style of this application.

Claims 1 - 8 have been rejected as being anticipated by Yamada.

New claim 11 has been added, and original claim 1 has been amended, to set forth features which are not anticipated by Yamada. With this Amendment Applicant is also including a Sketch A showing one embodiment of the invention as set forth in the present claims. Sketch A has labeled many of the features which correspond to the features in the claims. This sketch has been provided for the Examiner's benefit in understanding the claims, however Sketch A has not been provided to further limit the claims.

Claims 1 and 11 set forth that the second transporting guide includes a straight guide part and a deflecting guide part. The rejection appears to equate element 11 of Yamada with the straight guide part, and elements 22 or 70 of Yamada with the deflecting guide part. Claim 1 sets forth a second apparatus provided at the straight guide part and performing processing for the second sheet in a case where the second sheet is transported along the straight guide part. The rejection equates element 26 (scanner) of Yamada with the second apparatus of claim 1. Applicant has reviewed Yamada, especially column 6 lines 49 - 58 of Yamada. Applicant finds that element 26 is described as an image reading unit, and appears to read the image while the document is in the area of element 22. Applicant notes that element 22 has been equated with the deflecting guide part of the present invention. However claim 1 sets forth that the second apparatus processes the second sheet where the second sheet is transported along the straight guide part. Since the second apparatus of claim 1 processes along a straight guide part,

and element 26 of Yamada processes along element 22 which has been equated with the deflecting guide part, elements 26 and 22 of Yamada do not have the same relationship as the second apparatus and straight guide part of claim 1. Since Yamada does not describe this relationship between the second apparatus and straight guide part, Yamada cannot anticipate all of the features of claim 1. Claim 1 therefore defines over Yamada.

Claim 11 also sets forth a second apparatus where the second apparatus processes the second sheet when the second sheet is transported along the straight guide part of the second transporting guide. As described above, element 26 of Yamada appears to perform image reading when a document is in the area of element 22, and element 22 has been equated with the deflecting guide portion. Therefore the relationship between the second apparatus and the straight guide path set forth in claim 11 is not present in Yamada. Claim 11 therefore also defines over Yamada.

Claims 1 and 11 also set forth a first apparatus provided in a space of the housing between the deflecting guide part of the second transporting sheet, and the first transporting guide. The rejection equates element 50 of Yamada with this first apparatus. Element 50 has been indicated by Yamada as being an image recording system. Applicant notes that while element 50 in Fig. 2 of Yamada may point to an area between element 70 and feeding path A of Yamada, it appears that the lead line for element 50 is misleading. Most of the parts of element 50 are shown to the left of element 70 or 22 in Fig. 2 of Yamada. Applicant also notes that the arrow on the end of the lead line of element 50 appears to be directing the person to the left of element 70 or 22. Therefore it appears that the image recording system 50 of

Yamada is not arranged between a deflecting guide part of a second transporting guide, and a first transporting guide. Claims 1 and 11 therefore further define over Yamada.

Claim 1 also sets forth a first transporting mechanism transporting the first sheet, and a second transporting mechanism transporting the second sheet. Claim 1 sets forth that the first sheet and the second sheet are transported in substantially a same direction. Applicant has reviewed Yamada, and finds no teaching nor suggestion of any transporting mechanisms which transport first and second sheets in first and second transporting guides in substantially a same direction. From Applicant's understanding of Yamada, it appears that Yamada transfers one sheet along path A which appears to be in a clockwise direction, and another sheet along path B which appears to be in a counterclockwise direction. These directions are opposite to each other, and therefore Yamada does not teach nor suggest any transporting mechanism which transports two separate sheets in two separate transporting guides in a same direction. Furthermore, the opposite directions of Yamada actually lead a person away from transporting sheets in a same direction in different guides. Claim 1 therefore further defines over Yamada.

Claim 11 sets forth that at direction of transport of the straight guide parts are in substantially a same direction. Applicant is unsure of which part of Yamada would be equated with the straight guide part of the first transporting guide. Applicant notes that if element 7 of Yamada is equated with the straight guide portion of the first transporting guide, a direction of transport of element 7 is not in the same direction as an element transport of element 11. In fact it appears that the directions of transport in elements 7 and 11 are opposite. Therefore elements 7, 11 and directions of transport in Yamada are not the same as the straight guide parts of the

first and second transporting guides and the same direction of transport as in claim 11. Claim 11 therefore further defines over Yamada.

Claims 1 and 11 set forth first and second delivery ports which are on the same side of the housing. In the present invention, especially as shown in the embodiment of Fig. 1a, the ports are shown on the right side of the housing by reference numbers 5 and 7. Applicant has reviewed Yamada, and it appears that any delivery port for the path A in Yamada would be arranged on the top, and any delivery port for path B of Yamada will be arranged on the right side in Fig. 2. These delivery ports in Yamada would not be on the same side. Therefore Yamada does not appear to have delivery ports that have the same relationship as the first and second delivery ports of claims 1 and 11. Claims 1 and 11 therefore further define over Yamada.

New claim 9 has been added to further emphasize the direction that the sheets travel in the first and second guides. In particular claim 9 indicates that the upper part of the first transporting guide is in an upstream position when compared with a lower part of the transporting guide. A likewise arrangement is set forth with regard to the second transporting guide. The direction of transporting in claim 9 is therefore clearly set forth as being from upper to lower. This appears to be in direct contrast to path A in Fig. 2 of Yamada. Therefore claim 9 further defines over Yamada, especially with regard to the first transport guide of the present invention, and path A of Yamada.

New claim 12 also further set forth features with regard to the transporting of sheets in the first and second guides. Claim 12 sets forth that the sheet is transported in the first guide

from the straight guide part to the deflecting guide part, and likewise in the second transporting guide. Applicant finds no teaching nor suggestion in Yamada of transporting from straight guide parts to deflecting guide parts, especially where those guide parts have the relationship set forth in claim 11, from which claim 12 depends. Claim 12 therefore further defines over Yamada.

New claim 10 has been added to set forth that the second apparatus is a scanner which is detachable from the multifunction apparatus and useable as a scanner when detached from the multifunction apparatus. Applicant has reviewed Yamada, and finds no teaching nor suggestion of any scanner in Yamada being detachable from a remainder of the apparatus of Yamada, and being useable as a scanner when detached. Claim 10 therefore further defines over Yamada.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which would further favorable prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative by telephone to discuss possible changes.

At this time Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, and based on the above amendments and remarks, respectfully solicits allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted
for Applicant,

By: 

Theobald Dengler
Registration No. 34,575
MCGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.

TD:tf